



# RESEARCH REPORT

---

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	October 11, 2001
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>To:</b>	David Smith, County Administrative Officer
<b>From:</b>	Sandi Wilson, Deputy County Administrative Officer Christopher M. Bradley, Budget Manager
<b>Prepared By:</b>	Sylvia Romero, Senior Management & Budget Analyst

---

---

## Issue

The purpose of the Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing analysis is to provide a staffing recommendation to the Board of Supervisors so that they may determine the need for additional positions, if any, for the Superior Court Pretrial Services Defendant Monitoring Unit and other functions.

## Background

Superior Court requested base funding of \$2,337,937 and 49 FTEs for Pretrial Services Agency (PSA) for FY 2001-02. They received \$2,339,332, including 49 fully funded FTEs. However, Superior Court has re-assigned 5 of those FTEs to other areas of the court.

Superior Court's Managing for Results strategic plan includes a Pretrial Supervision Activity in its Pre-Adjudication Program. The purpose is to provide supervision of conditionally-released defendants to the court and interested parties so they can successfully complete release conditions without termination.

Superior Court requested 8 additional Pretrial Service Officer positions and 2 Court Information Processor positions for PSA Defendant Monitoring Unit (DMU) as a Results Initiative Request, part of their FY 2001-02 budget submission. They related the need for the new positions to the increase in the total supervision caseload currently handled by the DMU.

The most recent staffing study available is the Citizens Advisory Committee on Jail planning conducted in 1997. At that time, they issued three recommendations to modify the Pretrial Services Agency (PSA) and economize jail space. The recommendations were to be implemented over 15 years. The three recommendations were as follows:

- (1) Expansion of the PSA through the addition of 32 new positions from the existing 37 (these included the 5 FTEs later re-assigned to different areas of the court),

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	2

for a total of 69 positions. This would enable the PSA to increase its supervisory capacity from 530 cases to 1,200. The Citizens Advisory Committee estimated that the effort would yield an annual cost avoidance of \$7.9 million.

Status: Since FY 1997, PSA has increased to a total of 49 positions, less the 5 positions that Superior Court assigned to other areas of the court, for a total of 44. Specifically, the number of Jail Unit positions that support the Initial Appearance (IA) Court increased by 12, and supervisors currently carry full PSA interview caseloads.

- (2) The implementation of an Electronic Monitoring program. The initial recommendation was to start with 50 units and then expand to 150 units by the year 2012. The recommended caseload per officer was 25.

Status: 100 units are in place and 4 officers are currently operating.

- (3) Funding of a study to re-validate the Pretrial Service Bail Classification Matrix. The benefits of the study were to enhance public safety, instill faith in the judges for the process and serve as a base for expanding the Pretrial Services Agency.

Status: The study was funded. Since February 1999, PSA has been working on a revalidation study and then a replacement bail matrix with the Pretrial Services Resource Center. Revisions and resistance to several of the variables used has protracted the process. PSA expects to have a new matrix Beta tested during the second quarter of FY 2002, and validated by the end of the year.

#### Benchmarks

Superior Court cited the 60:1 Adult Probation Officer staffing ratio as adopted in A.R.S. §12-251, for DMU officers carrying supervision caseloads to justify their request. They explained that the statute was amended in 1981 by the 35<sup>th</sup> Arizona State Legislature in response to the American Probation and Parole Association recommendation that probation officers supervise no more than 60 offenders.

Superior Court also uses a 25:1 staffing ratio for the PSA Electronic Monitoring Unit, which operates on a 24-hour and 7-days per week basis. This ratio is based on A.R.S. §13-916 benchmarks for Adult Probation intensive cases. This statute provides a staffing ratio of 25:2 and 40:3 for Probation Officers.

#### Pretrial Service Agency Functions

Superior Court describes the principal responsibilities of the PSA as:

- 1) Gathering and presenting information about newly arrested defendants and available release options to the courts.

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	3

- 2) Supervising defendants' pretrial status by monitoring compliance with release conditions and helping to ensure they appear for scheduled events.

Superior Court described the tasks necessary to accomplish the main responsibilities of the PSA:

- Interviewing all arrested defendants to assist the Initial Appearance (IA) court in making release determinations
- Monitoring all defendants released under PSA supervision
- Locating Failure to Appear (FTA) defendants from the arraignment calendars prior to the issuance of a bench warrant
- Monitoring the in-custody jail population for PSA releases
- Preparing Bond Review Reports

Superior Court provided a detailed description of how the PSA tasks are distributed among the staff:

<b>PSA FUNCTIONS</b>	
<b>JAIL UNIT</b>	<b>FTE</b>
Jail Interviews	15
Jail Interviews Supervisor	2
Administrative	1
Total Jail Unit	18
<b>DEFENDANT MONITORING UNIT</b>	
Defendant Monitoring	9.5
Defendant Monitoring Unit Supervisor	2
Electronic Monitoring	4
Electronic Monitoring Supervisor	1
Bond Reduction Unit	1
Bond Reduction Reports	0.5
Justice System Coordinator/ Substance Abuse Liaison	1
In-Custody Monitoring	0.5
Failure to Appear Unit	0.5
Administrative	2
Total Defendant Monitoring Unit	22
<b>OVERALL PRETRIAL SERVICES AGENCY</b>	
Administrator	1
Supervisor (works where needed in PSA)	1
Administrative	2
Total Overall Pretrial Service Agency	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>44</b>

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	4

Superior Court elaborated in describing the more recent developments that have taken place in the DMU and on how they carry out their functions.

#### DMU – Case Management Strategy

Superior Court stated that prior to fiscal year 2001, PSA strictly focused on monitoring and enforcement in the DMU. Since that time, a new vision has been adopted for the agency to provide services through a case management strategy. According to Superior Court, this new approach increases supervision options including mandated face-to-face client contacts, field visits allowing for employment and residence verification, attendance at provider staffing, increase of time with each client proportionate to their risk and needs and matching defendants with social services. Superior Court believes that case management will result in a reduction of failure to appear and re-arrest cases. Furthermore, they estimate that a large percentage of the pretrial population ends up under probation supervision. Therefore, they feel they can further benefit the defendants with social services at an earlier stage while under pretrial supervision.

PSA is currently transitioning into operating under the case management strategy. Superior Court has indicated that the completion of the transition will require:

- Evaluation of standards for caseload monitoring based on risk/need;
- Development of policies and procedures;
- Validation of risk instrument to determine supervision level of defendants and change the traditional labels of “general” and “intensive” cases to minimum, medium or maximum levels.
- Evaluation of placing minimal supervision cases on a large administrative caseload.

Until the transition is complete, the DMU continues to use the “General” and “Intensive” categories for case supervisions.

#### **Discussion**

The purpose of the PSA staffing discussion is to provide recent caseload data, a current staffing analysis and various staffing models to the Office of Management and Budget so that a recommendation can be made to the Board of Supervisors on the need, if any, for additional positions in the DMU.

#### Impact of High Caseload to Superior Court, Community, Public, Safety, etc.

Superior Court maintains that when the two critical functions of PSA are adequately staffed, unnecessary detentions are minimized, jail overcrowding is reduced, public safety is increased and released defendants will more often appear for court.

Superior Court does not currently collect any data that measures the impact on the court, the public or the community due to Officers carrying high supervision caseloads.

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	5

However, they identify the benefits of providing adequately staffed supervision to include:

- Lower cost than incarceration
- Protection of the public by reducing the risk of defendants under supervision to commit crimes
- When court ordered, supervision provides substance abuse treatment to enable defendants to cope without relying on drugs or alcohol
- Supervision allows defendants to live with their families, hold jobs and be productive members of society.
- Supervision can help defendants with mental health issues or in need of educational, vocational or social services, network with more community service agencies.
- Supervision directly impacts a lower number of failure to appear situations, the reduction of protracted case processing and a decrease in the incarcerated population.

#### Family of Measures

Superior Court estimates that approximately 65-70% of those defendants who report to PSA for supervision successfully complete release conditions without termination. However, they project that the number of defendants who never report to court-ordered supervision is about 15-20%.

Superior Court's Managing for Results strategic plan included several performance measures relating to PSA:

- Result - Percentage of defendants who successfully complete release conditions without termination.
- Output - Number of pretrial defendants receiving supervision within agency guidelines.
- Output – Number of officer contacts.
- Output - Number of pretrial defendants successfully completing supervision without termination
- Demand – Anticipated number of defendants in pretrial release
- Efficiency – Cost per officer contact.

#### Initial Appearance Interviews / Referrals

Defendant referrals for PSA supervision arrive from three sources, the PSA Jail Unit at the Madison Jail, the Superior Court bench and the Justice Courts.

The PSA Jail Unit staff conduct Initial Appearance (IA) interviews with in-custody Madison Jail defendants for the purpose of issuing bond reports to the court prior to the initial hearing. These are **pre-appearance** interviews of arrested defendants.

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	6

The PSA Jail Unit Staff does not interview defendants referred from the Superior Court bench and the Justice Courts. Therefore, these are **post-appearance** cases referred to PSA for supervision.

During the last three fiscal years, the Jail Unit has achieved a manageable 24-hour operation. Furthermore, a greater percentage of interviews have resulted in PSA referrals. This accomplishment can be related to the following factors:

- The Initial Appearance Court has **full-time** hearing officers who are court commissioners, not regular judges.
- The Jail Unit no longer has to interview misdemeanors, except for DUI and domestic violence misdemeanors.
- Since FY 2001, the case management strategy has begun to be implemented, therefore increasing supervision options offered by PSA that resulted in an augmented utilization of services by the bench.
- Superior Court provided the total number of IA interviews conducted by the PSA Jail Unit, and the total number of PSA Referrals generated from the Initial Appearance Court at the Madison Jail during the last three fiscal years.

**Initial Appearance Interviews (Pre-appearance)**

<b>FY 1999</b>	45,166	Includes most misdemeanors
<b>FY 2000</b>	35,963	Only includes DUI and domestic violence misdemeanors
<b>FY 2001</b>	35,519	Only includes DUI and domestic violence misdemeanors

**PSA Referrals Related to Initial Appearance Interviews**

	<b>IA Interviews</b>	<b>IA Referrals</b>	<b>% of referrals related to interviews</b>	
<b>FY 1999</b>	45,166	2,126	5%	Includes most misdemeanors
<b>FY 2000</b>	35,963	2,863	8%	Only includes DUI and domestic violence misdemeanors
<b>FY 2001</b>	35,519	4,013	11%	Only includes DUI and domestic violence misdemeanors

**PSA Referrals from Initial Appearance Court**

		<b>Increase</b>
<b>Referrals FY 1999</b>	2,126	
<b>Referrals FY 2000</b>	2,863	34.7%
<b>Referrals FY 2001</b>	4,013	40.2%

The "PSA Referrals Related to Initial Appearance Interviews" table reflects the consistent increase in referrals stemming from the Initial Appearance court during the last three years.

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	7

Superior Court also provided the total number of PSA Referrals from both, IA Court and Justice Courts combined.

**PSA Referrals from Initial Appearance Court and Justice Courts**

<b>Referrals FY 1999</b>	4,120	<b>Increase</b>
<b>Referrals FY 2000</b>	5,690	38.11%
<b>Referrals FY 2001</b>	6,609	16.15%

Based on the above information we can conclude that the increase in referrals can be attributed to a greater tendency for IA interviews to result in PSA referrals.

Caseload by type of case: General, Intensive, Electronic Monitoring

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	8

Superior Court provided the monthly PSA Average Daily Caseloads for the last 3 fiscal years categorized by type of case including General, Intensive and Electronic Monitoring.

	GENERAL & INTENSIVE				EM		All Cases	
	General	Intensive	Total	% Change	EM	% Change	Total	% Change
<b>FY 1999</b>								
July	344	164	508		0	0	508	
August	323	168	491	-3.3%	0	0	491	-3.3%
September	336	164	500	1.8%	0	0	500	1.8%
October	330	146	476	-4.8%	0	0	476	-4.8%
November	266	177	443	-6.9%	0	0	443	-6.9%
December	311	130	441	-0.5%	0	0	441	-0.5%
January	345	138	483	9.5%	0	0	483	9.5%
February	379	141	520	7.7%	0	0	520	7.7%
March	467	145	612	17.7%	0	0	612	17.7%
April	476	161	637	4.1%	0	0	637	4.1%
May	509	172	681	6.9%	0	0	681	6.9%
June	507	183	690	1.3%	0	0	690	1.3%
<b>FY 2000</b>								
July	542	173	715	3.6%	0	0	715	3.6%
August	555	190	745	4.2%	0	0	745	4.2%
September	557	205	762	2.3%	0	0	762	2.3%
October	576	193	769	0.9%	0	0	769	0.9%
November	593	208	801	4.2%	0	0	801	4.2%
December	641	212	853	6.5%	0	0	853	6.5%
January	700	212	912	6.9%	0	0	912	6.9%
February	684	231	915	0.3%	0	0	915	0.3%
March	675	228	903	-1.3%	0	0	903	-1.3%
April	673	225	898	-0.6%	0	0	898	-0.6%
May	628	244	872	-2.9%	0	0	872	-2.9%
June	618	294	912	4.6%	20		932	6.9%
<b>FY 2001</b>								
July	628	300	928	1.8%	17	-15.0%	945	1.4%
August	597	315	912	-1.7%	23	35.3%	935	-1.1%
September	564	338	902	-1.1%	29	26.1%	931	-0.4%
October	524	349	873	-3.2%	51	75.9%	924	-0.8%
November	471	365	836	-4.2%	58	13.7%	894	-3.2%
December	501	395	896	7.2%	63	8.6%	959	7.3%
January	525	343	868	-3.1%	63	0.0%	931	-2.9%
February	475	301	776	-10.6%	68	7.9%	844	-9.3%
March	511	313	824	6.2%	74	8.8%	898	6.4%
April	577	381	958	16.3%	70	-5.4%	1028	14.5%
May	546	335	881	-8.0%	85	21.4%	966	-6.0%
June	666	375	1041	18.2%	73	-14.1%	1114	15.3%
<b>FY 2002</b>								
July	696	388	1084	4.1%	79	8.2%	1163	4.4%
August	680	431	1111	2.5%	70	-11.4%	1181	1.5%
<b>Average Daily Caseloads FY 1999</b>	383	157	540		0		540	
<b>Average Daily Caseloads FY 2000</b>	620	218	838	55.2%	2		840	55.5%
<b>Average Daily Caseloads FY 2001</b>	549	343	891	6.3%	56		947	12.8%

#### Caseload Projections

Caseload projections for FY 2002 excluded data from FY 1999 due to a significant variation in the average daily caseloads for the year that are attributed to internal management changes.



<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	9

In order to provide a more realistic projection of caseloads for FY 2002, OMB decided to compare the daily caseloads for the months of July and August FY 2001 to those of July and August FY 2002.

	<b>General Cases</b>	<b>Intensive Cases</b>	<b>Total Gen &amp; Intensive</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Average Daily Caseload for the 2 months</b>	<b>% Increase</b>
<b>Daily Caseloads - July - FY 2001</b>	628	300	928			
<b>Daily Caseloads - August - FY 2001</b>	597	315	912	<b>1,840</b>	<b>920</b>	
<b>Daily Caseloads - July - FY 2002</b>	696	388	1084			
<b>Daily Caseloads - August - FY 2002</b>	680	431	1111	<b>2,195</b>	<b>1,098</b>	<b>19%</b>

The average daily caseload for July and August FY 2001 combined was 920. The average for July and August FY 2002 was 1,098, an increase of 178 cases or 19%

In order to project the average daily caseload for FY 2002, OMB used the 19% increase for July and August, and applied it to the average daily caseloads of FY 2001 (891). The result was that the average daily caseload for FY 2002 is projected to increase to **1,061** ( $891 + 19\% = 1,061$ ).

The average daily caseloads peaked in July and August FY 2001, but were lower in later months.

#### Staffing Ratios

Superior Court presented the DMU staffing ratio as 105.2:1. This ratio was based on the total average daily caseload of 947 for fiscal year 2001 and DMU total staffing of 9 Officer positions.

OMB has corrected Superior Court's staffing ratio calculation by using the average daily caseload for General and Intensive cases only, which totaled 891 (the remaining 56 cases are Electronic Monitoring and are handled by 4 separate Officers). The calculation also included a total of 9.5 officer FTEs, which carry supervision caseloads. The corrected staffing ratio is 93.8:1 ( $891 \div 9.5 = 93.8$ ).

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	10

	<b>FY 01 Average Daily Cases</b>	<b>No. of Officers</b>	<b>Cases per Officer</b>	<b>General Cases (59.7%)</b>	<b>Intensive Cases (40.3%)</b>
<b>Superior Court's Staffing Ratio Calculation</b>	947	9	105.2	62.8	42.4
<b>OMB Correction of Superior Court's Staffing Ratio Calculation *</b>	891	9.5	93.8	56.0	37.8

\* FY 01 Total Cases do not include Electronic  
Monitoring Cases

As indicated in the table above, the breakdown of cases between the officers results in average of 62.8 (59.7%) of General Cases and 42.3 (40.3%) Intensive Cases. Using Superior Court's percentages of General and Intensive cases per officer, OMB concluded that the average General case per Officer is 56 and the average Intensive case per Officer is 37.8, if an officer had both types of cases.

### Staffing Models

#### Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendations (1997)

Superior Court requested 8 additional PSA Officer positions and 2 Court Information Processor positions for the DMU based on the recommendations made by the Citizens Advisory Committee on Jail Planning in 1997. The recommendation stated that a total of 69 employees were needed to properly staff the agency when it reached a caseload of 1,200 defendants. However, the Citizens Advisory Committee staffing recommendation was for the entire PSA, not just the DMU. Therefore, this methodology is not useful in determining the staffing needs of the DMU.

The methodology used by Superior Court included the subtraction of their total number of positions at the time, 42 (not including the 5 PSA positions moved to other areas of the court), from the 69 recommended positions to determine that they needed 27 positions ( $69 - 42 = 27$ ) to manage the targeted caseload of 1200. Since their caseload at the time was estimated at 900, this only made up 75% of the targeted 1200 cases ( $900 \div 1200 = 75\%$ ). Superior Court determined that out of the 27 positions required to manage 1200 cases, they actually needed only 20 ( $27 \times 75\% = 20$ ) since they had only reached 75% of the 1200 caseload baseline. They chose to only request 8 positions.

	<b>Caseload</b>	<b>% of Baseline</b>	<b>Total Positions Recommended</b>	<b>PSA's Current Staffing Level</b>	<b>Proposed Positions</b>
<b>Superior Court's Methodology</b>					
1997 Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendations	1200	100%	69	42	27
FY 2001 Cases/Month as presented by Superior Court	900	75%			20

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	11

OMB determined that if the 1997 Citizens Advisory Committee recommendations were to be used as the basis for determining the FY 2002 PSA staffing needs, the above methodology is incorrect. The correct methodology should have calculated the percentage of total positions needed, as compared to the percentage of total cases managed (69 Total Recommended Positions x 75% of caseload baseline).

OMB has determined that the 1997 Citizens Advisory Committee recommendations are **no longer useful** to determine the appropriate staffing levels of the DMU or the entire PSA for the following reasons:

- The recommendations were for the entire PSA staffing, but only based on the supervision caseload of the DMU. The distinct caseloads and functions for the Jail Unit, Planning and Development and Financial Review Unit were not considered at all. Ideally, the basis for the recommendations should have analyzed the staffing needs of each unit separately, given their different functions and different caseloads. The Citizens Advisory Committee staffing recommendation was fine as a master-planning document, but not detailed enough to determine annual staffing levels.
- The 1997 Citizens Advisory Committee projected an average daily caseload increase of 670 cases over fifteen years. At the time the report was written, the projection baseline was 530 cases increasing to 1,200 (In 1999 OMB completed a caseload analysis annualizing the fifteen-year caseload, and determined the actual baseline average came in at 482). The actual caseload numbers from 1997 through 2001, as presented in the following table, demonstrate that the 1997 Citizens Advisory Committee projections are no longer applicable to current circumstances:

**Fifteen-Year Annualized Caseload Analysis  
Based on Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendations**

Year	15-Year Caseload Projection	Actual Caseload	% of Projection
FY 1997	482	482	
FY 1998	527	499	-5%
FY 1999	571	540	-5%
FY 2000	616	838	36%
FY 2001	661	891	35%
FY 2002	705	1061	OMB Projection
FY 2003	750		
FY 2004	795		
FY 2005	839		
FY 2006	884		
FY 2007	929		
FY 2008	973		
FY 2009	1018		
FY 2010	1063		
FY 2011	1107		
FY 2012	1152		

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	12

- The 1997 Citizens Advisory Committee recommendation of 69 positions for PSA was separate from the Electronic Monitoring positions. Therefore, the base number of 69 staff used for this request should not have included the Electronic Monitoring positions in the methodology.
- The base number of 69 staff used for this request included the 5 positions that Superior Court transferred out of PSA into other areas of the court.

#### Other Counties

OMB interviewed representatives of six county Pretrial Services Agencies in Arizona, California and Texas with the intent to reach a better sense of the staffing ratios they used and how these may be applied to Maricopa County.

The table below provides a comparison of all the staffing ratios currently used by the six Counties interviewed. The ratios vary a great deal due to the specific variations of cases and jurisdictional rules that each agency has to abide by for their community. Therefore, OMB determined that a staffing ratio for Maricopa County could not be reached with the limited information researched from these counties.

<b>County</b>	<b>Ratio</b>
Pima County	60:1
Harris County	150:1
El Paso County	130:1
San Mateo County	60:1 - 80:1
Santa Clara County	100:1

The detailed information from the survey is included in the appendix.

#### Bail Review Project

Superior Court is requesting additional staffing for the Bail Review Project based on a study conducted by a McJustice Subcommittee from June 18, 2001 to July 20, 2001. A report of the study was provided at an Initial Appearance Court Reform meeting on August 18, 2001. A snapshot of pretrial detainees in the PSA Jail Unit was evaluated to determine if any defendants who are incarcerated would be eligible for PSA supervision referrals should a more in-depth investigation be conducted. The study determined that out of 480 cases reviewed, 123 or 25.6% had a possible change in status that would qualify for a bail review hearing.

According to Superior Court, approximately 3 cases per interview calendar merit a re-investigation in order to extend the number of defendants that can be referred to supervision by the PSA. The Initial Appearance Hearing Officers project that a minimum of 3 cases per calendar can be designated to the Bail Review Project. There are 5 calendars per day. This amounts to 105 bail reviews per week (3 x 5 x 7 = 105). Superior Court estimates that an Officer can complete 5 reports per day. Therefore,

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	13

they are requesting 3 additional Pretrial Service Officers to complete the Bail Review Project ( $15 \div 5 = 3$ ). It should be noted that the McJustice Subcommittee report did not make any personnel recommendations.

#### Recommendations

OMB has determined that the current case management strategy adopted by the PSA, and currently under implementation transition, makes the assessment of DMU staffing needs very difficult. A methodology using historical caseload data is unsuitable, since the cases are currently being handled differently than in past years.

##### 1. Comprehensive Case Management Strategy Cost and Benefit Analysis

OMB recommends that Superior Court complete a case management strategy cost and benefit analysis before implementing the case management approach in the operations of DMU. The purpose of the cost and benefit analysis will be to provide a comprehensive plan of staffing needs, expected measurable results and total costs to the Board of Supervisors so that they may determine if a case management strategy is feasible within the resources available for the County.

The comprehensive cost and benefit analysis must include a staffing model that will allow for the differentiation of case supervision, accurately describe officer caseloads and correctly determine the staffing needs of the DMU.

The analysis is to be completed by December 31, 2001 in preparation for the FY 2003 budget analysis. Until the cost and benefit is completed and meaning performance measures developed, OMB cannot recommend more than a provisional staff increase based on projected increases in caseload volume.

##### 2. Provisional PSO Staffing Recommendation

OMB provisionally recommends funding for 2 Officers until the cost and benefit analysis is complete and a more accurate staffing assessment can be made during the FY 2003 budget development period. The basis for the provisional recommendation is the following:

###### a. FY 2000 Staffing Ratio

OMB calculated a staffing ratio based on FY 2000 data. At that time, the DMU was staffed with 9.5 officers and managed a total average daily caseload of 838 cases. The staffing ratio for FY 2000 was 1:88 ( $838 \div 9.5 = 88$ ).

###### b. FY 2002 Caseload Projections

In the Discussion section of this report, OMB projected 1,061 average daily caseloads for FY 2002.

###### c. FY 2002 DMU Officers

OMB used the 88:1 staffing ratio from FY 2000 to determine that the DMU needs a total of 12 Officers to maintain the 88:1 staff ratio for FY 02 ( $1,061 \div 88 = 12$ ).

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	14

d. Pretrial Service Officer Turnover Rate

According to Maricopa County Human Resources Department, the FY 2001 turnover rate for all Pretrial Service Officers was 19.5%. The turnover rate for Pretrial Service Officer I was 62.5% and 25% for Pretrial Service Officer II.

Superior Court believes that the turnover can be related to the large number of caseloads assigned to PSA. They also expressed that frequent turnover requires existing officers to train new ones, and takes them away from caseload supervision.

3. CIP Staffing Recommendation

OMB recommends funding for 2 CIPs, in addition to the 2 PSOs, in order to relieve the administrative tasks currently handled by 2 PSOs. Such administrative tasks are outlined on page 3 of this report and include Bond Reduction Unit, Justice System Coordinator, Substance Abuse Liaison, In-Custody Monitoring and Failure to Appear Unit functions. According to Superior Court, the 2 new CIPs will relieve the equivalent of 1.25 FTE PSO positions that will be able manage caseloads. The cost-benefit analysis will determine what staffing effect this recommendation will result in for the DMU.

4. Managing for Results

OMB recommends modifications to the activities, services and performance measures of the Superior Court strategic plan. **OMB also recommends that the strategic plan include activities, services and performance measures to capture the functions of PSA under the case management strategy.**

Activities

OMB recommends an amendment to the Superior Court's strategic plan so that activities presented are a true picture of the functions carried out by PSA. According to the Managing for Results guidelines, activities form the "building blocks" of the strategic plan. Restructuring the activities will ensure that Superior Court will have the performance information at the operational level, to make resource allocation and other decisions during the budget process.

The strategic plan currently lists one PSA activity under the Pre-Adjudication Program:

- Pretrial Supervision Activity.

OMB recommends the listing of 2 activities for PSA:

- Pretrial Assessment Activity
- Pretrial Supervision Activity

Services

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	15

OMB also recommends the amendment to the Superior Court strategic plan to include an accurate listing of all services provided by PSA. According to the Managing for Results guidelines, services are defined as the product or deliverable that the customer actually receives. This detailed listing will allow PSA to track and monitor the critical elements of their functions in order to have relevant performance measures that will assist in the determining appropriate staffing levels.

The strategic plan currently lists one service under its Pretrial Supervision Activity:

- Provide supervision of conditionally-released defendants.

OMB recommended listing of services include:

- Intensive Defendant Monitoring
- General Defendant Monitoring
- Defendant Electronic Monitoring
- Bond Reduction Reports
- Jail Interviews
- Referrals (List type of Referrals)
- Defendant Failure to Appear Investigations

#### Performance Measures

OMB recommends that the amendment to Superior Court's strategic plan also include additional performance measures. According to the Managing for Results guidelines, performance measures are tied directly to the operations of the department and generate the information that managers need to demonstrate results and returns on investment.

The strategic plan currently lists four performance measures under its Pretrial Supervision Activity:

- Result – % of defendants who successfully complete release conditions without termination.
- Outputs - # of pretrial defendants receiving supervision within agency guidelines  
# of officer contacts  
# of pretrial defendants successfully completing supervision without termination.
- Demand – Anticipated number of defendants in pretrial release.
- Efficiency – Cost per officer contact

OMB recommended listing of additional performance measures to include:

- Output - # of jail beds saved per day.
- Average daily supervision population.
- # of jail interviews
- # of bond reduction reports
- # of FTA Unit referrals
- # of FTA Unit referrals that avoid a bench warrant

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	16

The revisions are to be completed by October 31, 2001. Without the strategic plan modifications, it will be difficult for OMB to make an accurate staffing assessment of the PSA during the FY 2003 budget analysis period.

#### 5. Comprehensive Bail Review Project

OMB recommends that Superior Court complete a comprehensive Bail Review Project cost and benefit analysis before implementing the project. The purpose of the cost and benefit analysis will be to provide a plan of staffing needs, expected measurable results and total costs to the Board of Supervisors so they may determine if the Bail Review Project is feasible within the resources available for the County.

**Maricopa County is currently projecting significant revenue shortfalls for FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03. The Board of Supervisors recently adopted budget balancing guidelines and plan in order to resolve any possible revenue shortages. OMB recommends that the funding recommended for Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency staffing be deferred until the budget is balanced.**

#### Total Cost

The total cost of the staffing recommendation for FY 2002 is \$110,813. Personnel may be hired effective November 1, 2001. Total personnel costs for the FY 02 (8-months) are \$90,220. Total Operating Costs include first-year computer lease costs of \$2,333 and one-time operating costs of \$18,260, for a grand total of \$20,593.

The impact for FY 2003 is \$135,330 in Personnel costs and \$3,500 in Operating costs, for a total of \$138,830. A break down of the expenses is as follows:

	<b>FY 2001-02 PSA Adopted Budget *</b>	<b>FY 2001-02 PSA Staffing Recommendation</b>	<b>FY 2001-02 PSA Revised Budget</b>	<b>PSA Staffing Recommendation FY 2002-03 Impact</b>
<b>Personal Services</b>	2,054,333	90,220	2,144,553	135,330
<b>Operations</b>	284,999	20,593	305,592	3,500
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	2,339,332	110,813	2,450,145	138,830

\* Superior Court has revised the PSA adopted budget with a reduction of \$147,225 since the beginning of FY 2002.



<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	17

**Personal Services**

	<b>Annual Salary</b>	<b>Variable Benefits</b>	<b>Fixed Benefits</b>	<b>Total Salary &amp; Benefits</b>
PSA Officer	\$ 35,714	\$ 3,621	\$ 3,283	\$ 42,618
PSA Officer	\$ 35,714	\$ 3,621	\$ 3,283	\$ 42,618
CIP	\$ 19,760	\$ 2,004	\$ 3,283	\$ 25,047
CIP	\$ 19,760	\$ 2,004	\$ 3,283	\$ 25,047
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL</b>				<b>\$ 135,330</b>
<b>FY 02 Total Cost (Funding Effective 11/1/01)</b>				<b>90,220</b>

**OPERATIONS**

	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Per Unit Cost</b>	<b>Total</b>
Desk / Return	2	855	1,710
Keyboard Trays / Ergonomics	4	400	1,600
Task Chairs	4	500	2,000
Side Chairs	4	200	800
Bookcases	2	120	240
File Cabinets	2	250	500
Fax Machine	1	2,000	2,000
Radios	2	3,000	6,000
Badges	2	125	250
Phones	4	365	1,460
Bulletproof Vests	2	850	1,700
<b>One-Time Operating Costs</b>			<b>18,260</b>
<b>3-Year Lease Costs</b>			
Computers	4	1,825	
Printers	1	2,000	
Software	4	300	
<b>Total 3-Year Lease Costs</b>		<b>10,500</b>	
<b>1-Year Lease Costs</b>		<b>3,500</b>	
<b>FY 02 Lease Costs (8-months)</b>		<b>2,333.33</b>	<b>2,333</b>
<b>Total FY 02 Operating Costs</b>			<b>\$20,593</b>

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	18

## APPENDIX

- I. Survey information from six county Pretrial Services Agencies in Arizona, California and Texas.

### Pima County

Pima County, Arizona does not follow a statutory staffing ratio, and uses the legislative 60:1 ratio used by their Probation Department as a guide. They consider this a manageable number. Officers handle a mix of cases with different levels of supervision. In Pima County, a typical officer supervision caseload ranges from 45 – 50 cases.

### Harris County

Supervision case allocation in Harris County, Texas is not based on a legislative ratio, but rather on the number of courts they have. The ratio of Courts to Officer varies, since some courts have heavier caseloads than others. Officers take on a combination of “General” and “Special” cases. Furthermore, one officer may handle specific types of cases for all the courts, such as mental health cases. Each officer handles an average of 150 cases.

### El Paso County

El Paso County, Texas uses a staffing ratio of 130:1 as a guide, based on the Probation Department Ratio. This ratio was developed by the Department’s goal setting process and state recommendations. Pretrial Services relies on their own knowledge as to how to vary the assignments between staff. Assignments average 120:1 ratio, but may also vary. For example, one officer may handle 100 cases that are very intense, whereas another officer may handle 150 “slow” cases.

### Riverside County

Pretrial Services in Riverside County, California places a great emphasis on Pre-arraignment Investigation, and to a lesser extent the defendant release supervision program. Riverside County has numerous special courts designed to expedite the entire court process very efficiently, and most defendants do not have to spend more than 48 hours in custody. Sentencing and probation assignments are completed so quickly that release with condition cases are kept at a minimum. Only 2 support staff are dedicated to supervision, and average monthly caseloads total 100. Riverside County ratio is not included in the table presented in the Discussion section, because the staffing formula is different than that used by the other Counties.

### San Mateo County

Pretrial Services in San Mateo County, California is contracted out to a private non-profit organization. Under their contract they are required to have a 60:1 –

<b>Catalog number</b>	02-002
<b>Date:</b>	10/11/01
<b>Subject:</b>	Superior Court Pretrial Services Agency Staffing
<b>Page:</b>	19

80:1 staffing ratio. Allocation of cases and staffing varies upon defendants' circumstances. Occasionally total cases per officer may reach 100. Officers are assigned a combination of cases that range from simpler level of supervision (phone calls) to more contacts (drug testing, visits).

#### Santa Clara County

Pretrial Services in Santa Clara County, California is an independent county department. They do not have a ratio by which they operate, and the County has chosen not to place a cap on caseloads. Full-time officers handle an average of 100 cases, sometimes going over. The combination of cases varies depending on the number of defendants available.